

REMARKS

Claims 6-7, 13-14, 20-24, 26-28, and 30-32 remain in the application, with Claims 21 and 28 having been amended. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are the independent claims herein.

It is noted that the above-indicated amendments to claims 21 and 28 are intended to address the Examiner's objections to those claims. The Examiner is thanked for pointing out the informalities now corrected by these amendments. No substantive amendments to the claims are being made in this paper. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6-7, 13-14, 20-24, 26-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dennis et al. (hereinafter, "Dennis") U.S. Patent No. 7,174,446 in view of Doherty et al. (hereinafter, "Doherty") U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018763.

This rejection is respectfully traversed for reasons that are set forth below.

Claim 6 is directed to a "method", which includes "receiving input from a user" and "in response to the input, selecting one of a BCV (boot connection vector) pointer and a BEV (bootstrap entry vector) pointer to have a non-null value". Further, claim 6 specifies that "the selecting includes changing the BCV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BEV pointer from a non-null value to a null value".

In explaining the rejection of claim 6, the Examiner relied primarily on the Dennis reference, but conceded that Dennis does not disclose the claim limitation of changing a BCV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing a BEV pointer from a non-null value to a null value. To make up for this deficiency in Dennis, the Examiner proposes to rely on the Doherty reference, and the Examiner states that Doherty discloses the claim limitation referred to in the previous sentence. However, applicants wish to respectfully point out to the Examiner that Doherty does not, in fact, disclose this claim limitation, and thus the reference does not support the Examiner's statement.

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Doherty reference, and it appears to applicants that Doherty does not mention either BCV or BEV pointers at all, and hence clearly fails to disclose changing such pointers from a null value to a non-null value or vice versa.

The Examiner referred to three specific paragraphs of Doherty, namely paragraphs 49, 50 and 53. These paragraphs do not discuss either of a BCV pointer or a BEV pointer, nor changing the same from a null value to a non-null value or vice versa.

Paragraph 49 of Doherty is concerned with different boot targets (a network, a floppy disk, or a hard disk) for a client computer 701. Although the client 701 may boot to any one of such targets depending on the circumstances, no mention is made in the paragraph of either BCV or BEV pointers, nor of changing the values of the same.

Paragraph 50 also describes the client 701 booting to various targets in various embodiments. Again, BCV and BEV pointers are not mentioned, and changing the values thereof is not mentioned.

Similarly, paragraph 53 mentions information that may control to what target the client 701 may boot, but once more this paragraph does not mention BCV or BEV pointers nor changing the values of such pointers.

In sum, the prior art cited by the Examiner fails to disclose the claim limitation of “changing the BCV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BEV pointer from a non-null value to a null value”. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not provided a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 6, and that the rejection of claim 6 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The above remarks are equally applicable to independent claims 13 and 20. These remarks are also applicable in substance to the other independent claims—7, 14 and 21. As noted in the response filed herein in July, claims 7, 14 and 21 are in a sense “mirror images” of claims 6, 13 and 20, in that claims 7, 14, 21 recite changing the BEV pointer from a null value to a non-null value and changing the BCV pointer from a non-null value to a null value. It is

believed to be clear from the above discussion that this limitation is equally lacking from the Doherty reference.

It is therefore respectfully requested that all of the pending rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

November 16, 2007
Date

/Nathaniel Levin/
Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460